

TO ADVERTISERS.

H. P. WILKINSON, our authorized canvassing agent for New York City and vicinity, will receive and forward advertisements for the *National Era* at the following rates: Advertisements can be left at his office, No. 22 Spruce street.

WASHINGTON, D. C.

THURSDAY, DECEMBER 6, 1855.

BILLS: BILLS!

Look out for your bills. They may drop out of your papers unperceived.

ENCOURAGING.

Our friends are doing nobly. Many who left us last year, come back this. If every friend of the paper continues to work, the reaction will be successful. Now is the time. Send in the clubs, so that new subscribers may begin with the session.

Congress met last Monday, at twelve o'clock. The administration members of the House concentrated on Mr. Richardson, of Illinois, as their candidate for the Speakership, and gave him 74 votes, out of 225, the whole number cast. The Opposition, as every one foresees, is divided, and there must be many balloting before it can be sufficiently harmonized to elect a Speaker.

A majority of the House was returned on the simple Anti-Slavery issue—but there are members of this majority who propose, in the selection of Speaker, to advance other issues—under. This is the source of all the difficulty in organizing the House. Were it not for the intervention of this element, an Anti-Slavery Speaker could be chosen without difficulty. The telegraphists and letter-writers are sending out all sorts of rumors and speculations—but the People may as well understand at once, that should the balloting be protracted for a month longer, it will be owing solely to the cause we have just pointed out.

Meantime, let the Opposition keep cool, and proceed calmly, and without hurry, allowing time for members to become acquainted with each other, and for prejudices to wear away.

TROUBLES IN KANSAS.

Reports of the beginning of civil war in Kansas reach us by the telegraph. They seem to have been conveyed first to the Missouri Legislature, where the election for Senator is pending, and then to have been forwarded to Washington. As might have been expected, the blame is laid on the Free State men. The Slave Propagandists, we all know, are a meek, long-forbearing tribe! It is said that Gov. Shannon has applied for help, and that the President has put the military at his disposal. We are inclined to think the rumors are exaggerated, for insister purposes.

PROSPECTS

Tenth Volume of the *National Era*, Washington, D. C.

G. BAILEY, EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR; JOHN G. WHITTIER, CORRESPONDING EDITOR.

The signs of the times indicate an approaching crisis in the conflict between Freedom and Slavery. The Democratic Party and the Whig, with their peculiar issues, have ceased to exist, the latter being totally disorganized; the organization of the former being appropriated as the machinery of a Party devoted to the Cause of Slavery, while nearly all that was healthy and progressive in both has been absorbed by the Anti-Slavery movement, now organized in the form of a Republican Party. The one great Question before the People is, the Slavery Question; and there are really but two Parties, the Republican and the Pro-Slavery.

Henceforth, these Parties must meet each other face to face. The Congress that shall meet within the next two weeks, must witness their first national struggle. Who shall be Speaker—what Power shall organize the House, constitute its Committees, initiate and determine its action?—will be the first questions to be settled. Next must be considered the affairs of Kansas. A spurious Delegate, chosen by fraudulent votes, at a spurious election, ordered by an illegal Legislature, representing the policy and interests of Missouri Slaveholders; and a genuine Delegate, chosen by the votes of actual settlers, at an election held in accordance with the principles of self-government, assumed to be embodied in the admission to the floor of Congress. At the same time will arise the question of the admission of Kansas as a State, in conformity to the application of its inhabitants, who, in Convention assembled, have duly formed a State Constitution. Add to this, a bill for the admission of Oregon as a free State—and Congress will have before it a series of practical questions of vast magnitude, involving the entire issue between the Slave Power and its opponents. The struggle will not be confined to that body. Already commenced among the People, it will derive new interest from the proceedings in Congress. All those Questions must enter into and decide the canvass for the Presidency now opened. The next twelve months, then, will be a period of surpassing importance. The People must array themselves under the banner of Republicanism, or the banner of Slavery. There can be no neutrality, no evasion, no compromise. There can be no intermediate parties, although there may be sinister factions working insidiously for the defeat of Republicanism, and the continuance of power in the hands of the Slaveholding oligarchy. He that is not for Freedom is against it.

The responsibilities of Republicans at such a moment cannot be too urgently impressed upon them. The great Question, to the exclusion of all others, should be made the test in Congress, and by the People, on every occasion, to every election. The work of organization ought to be vigorously prosecuted, till every county and town be fully prepared for the decisive struggle.

Above all, the Press should be put in active operation. Local and Metropolitan newspapers—there ought to be no jealousy between them—are alike needed. Republican papers should be encouraged, and their issues multiplied, until every man and woman, who can read, be furnished with the whole argument for Liberty.

To the readers of the *National Era* we address ourselves specially. It has fought the battles of Freedom for nine years, and is now entering its tenth campaign. What it has been, it will be. The doctrine it has urged, the aims it has announced, are all dear to it. Its course has been a straightforward one, without concealment, without compromise, without resort to questionable expedients to achieve temporary success. So long as the Republican Party shall continue true to the principles of Civil and Religious Liberty we have advocated through the *Era*, to the rights of conscience without distinction of sect, true to all the rights of

Humanity without regard to race or birth, the *Era* will labor for its ascendancy.

Our tenth volume will begin with the first of the new year. We need hardly say that no pains will be spared to maintain its position as a Literary and Family newspaper. We have on hand several new stories, and the promise of one from the pen of Mrs. Southworth, to commence in the first number of the new volume.

TERMS.

Single copy, one year - - - \$2
Three copies, one year - - - 5
Ten copies, one year - - - 15
Single copy, six months - - - 1
Five copies, six months - - - 5
Ten copies, six months - - - 8

Payments always in advance.
Voluntary agents are entitled to retain fifty cents commission on each yearly, and twenty-five cents on each semi-yearly, subscriber, except in the case of Clubs.

A Club of five subscribers, at \$2, will entitle the person making it up to a copy for six months; a Club of ten, at \$15, to a copy for one year. When a Club of subscribers has been forwarded, additions may be made to it on the same terms. It is not necessary that the members of a Club should receive their papers at the same post office.

A Club may be made up of either new or old subscribers.

Money may be forwarded, at any risk. Large amounts may be retained in drafts or certificates of deposit, to

G. BAILEY,
Proprietor *National Era*, Washington, D. C.

A POLITICAL SURVEY—HOW UNION IS TO BE EFFECTED.

Many men who still adhere to the Know Nothing Party. Let us reason together. The Michigan *Free Democrat*, a paper which we had supposed to be Republican, a week or two since remarked—

"Now that the Know Nothing party has become so extensively dominant in the country, it is a matter of some solicitude whether or not it will be spoiled by its unexpected success. One thing is certain, that a party so large and influential as this, and controlling so much of the affairs of Government, will be speedily compelled to avow its policy in the most distinct manner."

This is remarkable language for a *Republican* journal. It assumes, first, that the Know Nothing Party is pure and sound; secondly, that it has not yet avowed its policy! Must we say that this is a pretty fair illustration of the tactics of a large portion of the old Free Soil Press? Speaking of the differences of opinion among the Know Nothings in the several States, the same paper says—

"These differences will now undoubtedly either be reconciled, or some one of the measures of antagonistic policy will be taken up, and become the universal acceptance, and then we shall be enabled clearly to see just what the cause of Freedom has to expect at its hands."

This is the attitude of patient waiting on the footsteps of Know Nothingism, maintained by many old Anti-Slavery men. They have been laboring under the strange hallucination that this Secret Order was the chosen instrument of Heaven for the redemption of the nation; while others, not so deplorably misled, still would tamper with it, under the delusion that it can be made ultimately subservient to the Anti-Slavery Cause. The Cleveland *Leader*, for example, disappointed at the result of the Massachusetts election, "apprehends the great issue of Slavery and Freedom was too little attended to, while the question of Know Nothingism attracted too much notice. That the Know Nothings of Massachusetts are Anti-Slavery in their feelings, will not be denied; that they would have united with the Republicans on an Anti-Slavery platform, as we think, equally certain. Know Nothingism, as at first organized, is virtually dead in the North; but there is enough of it still left to be formidable when it is driven into a hostile alliance. We think that the Republicans of Massachusetts erred in this, though their platform, taken as a whole, was infinitely better than any other that was presented in that State."

The Republicans of Massachusetts, intending to be Republicans, and nothing else, went into the election upon the Slavery issue alone, selecting a standard-bearer representing that issue alone. They were wise and honest. The Know Nothings of Massachusetts, with all their Anti-Slavery professions, would not take that ground, for the simple reason that they determined to carry the State and administer its Government on Know Nothing principles. If the *Leader* approve of this policy, then he may blame the Republicans of Massachusetts; if not, he must justify them, and utterly condemn the Know Nothings.

The same paper, just before the Cincinnati Know Nothing Convention, could hardly believe that an attempt at reunion with the National Order would prevail.

"There are not a few who predict that the National Order will be a union with the National Republican party, and that it will make overtures of reconciliation to the Southern wing of the Order. Such we, in this section of the State, may feel disposed to ridicule such an idea, there can be no doubt that at least a portion of the delegates to that Convention will be favorable to it. It is barely possible that a reunion may be formed."

Some of us in this region thought differently; and we have not been disappointed by the resolution of the Convention to meet February 19th in Philadelphia, for the purpose of making terms with the National Council that will assemble on the 23d of the same month. The *Leader*, by way of warning to the Convention, remarked—"If the Northern wing of the Order should prove false to Freedom, no earthly power can save it from destruction!" "If"—"If"—"If"—and this while the ears of its editors are ringing with the shouts of Northern and Southern Know Nothings over the defeat of Republicanism in Massachusetts and New York!

Is there a Republican Party or not? Are its principles and policy right or not? Will the *Leader*, *Free Democrat*, and other papers that are constantly courting the Know Nothing Party, and hoping so much from it, tell us? If they answer in the affirmative, what have they to do with any other Party, but to oppose it? They are committing precisely the same error that some friends of Freedom used to commit, by expecting the Whig organization to do the work of the Independent Democratic Party. The Know Nothing Order, in seeking to exclude persons from office on account of birth and religion, and to protect the period of naturalization to twenty-one years, forfeits all claim to the support of true Republicanism, whose organization, if it has any characteristic views man as equal, abhors caste, holds sacred the rights of conscience, and can respect no civil distinctions founded upon race or creed. The two organizations are intrinsically irreconcilable.

It is time for the Republican Party and Press, in Ohio, Indiana, and Michigan, to assume and maintain a distinct, independent position. We know that the great body of the Party in those States, and a large portion of its Press, are sound to the core—but there are some who are disposed to play fast and loose—whether from lack of common sense or honesty, remains to be seen.

Time presses—the Presidential canvass is about opening—parties must take their true position, and settle their policies. The Republicans must understand each other, and be one in heart and action. If they would command respect and win assents, they must be true to

themselves and to their own principles: it will not do for some to pull one way, and some, another—for any of them to tamper with other Parties, whose their fellow-laborers are opposing. No Party can live, or deserve to live, the members of which do not maintain good faith to each other.

Let us survey the political field.
There will be three distinct nominations in the Presidential election—*Republican*, *Pro-Slavery*, *Democratic*, *Know Nothing* or *American*. Three Parties are already organized—the *Republican*, the *Pro-Slavery*, and the *Know Nothing*. The first represents the Principle of Liberty, the second, that of Slavery, the third, the policy of Caste and Compromise.

The Slavery-Democracy has an organization in every State of the Union, but is really as scanty in the slave States. It has been the main instrument of the Slave Power. Its one policy is, to yield to its exactions, and to enforce popular acquiescence in them. It repealed the Missouri Compromise, and it insists upon acquiescence in its repeal. The endorsement of the Fugitive Bill, of the Compromise of 1850, of the repeal of the Missouri Compromise, and of the policy embodied in them and implied by them, will be the test in the National Convention of the Party to be held in Cincinnati next year, and the sole issue tendered by its nominations.

The Republican Party is organized expressly to meet this issue. It refuses its endorsement to the Compromise and Fugitive Slave Bill, of the Missouri Compromise, and sticks to the Principle and Policy of all that preceded—the extension and nationalization of Slavery—it demands the total prohibition of Slavery in all Federal Territory.

These two Parties, then, confront each other on a single issue—Freedom and Slavery. Will the men who, adhering to the Know Nothing Order, profess devotion to the cause of Freedom, answer this question: Suppose these two Parties, so arrayed, should be left, undisturbed by any other organization, undisturbed by any other question, to decide this single, grand issue, by their votes next November, what would be the decision? Can they hesitate—can they for a moment doubt, that the Right would triumph, and the Slave Power be overthrown? But, another Party, with other issues, does intervene, and the result at once becomes doubtful. Who are responsible for this—who, responsible for this interfering in the conflict between the Slave Power and its Opponents, and for giving to the former a new lease of life? The twenty-four thousand Free-Soilers who voted a Know Nothing ticket in Massachusetts, and the thousands of Anti-Slavery men who are still tampering, in other States, with the Know Nothing Order.

Look at the exact position of this Party. We leave out of view its secret mummeries, of which it has grown ashamed—its extra-judicial oaths, which it professes to give—its anti-Christian policy of proscription, which it still clings to; our concern now is, simply with the position of the Party in its bearings on the Slavery Question. It was not organized with a view to meet this issue, to dispose of it in any way. What business, then, has any Anti-Slavery man, holding this issue to be of paramount importance? It has diverted a large share of public attention from this issue. Does this give it a claim upon their continued support? It has divided the free States on the issue; and yet, they adhere!

After the Order had been at work for a year, marshalling adherents in all the States, from all the Parties, in some States absorbing nearly all the Anti-Slavery voters, it held its National Convention, and, to the surprise of these deluded voters, adopted a platform affirming acquiescence in the Compromise of 1850, in the Fugitive Act, in the repeal of the Missouri Compromise—in a word, in all existing laws on the subject of Slavery. Some of the Northern members seceded, others adhered. The seceders were stationed at home, but what followed? Not a single State Council disbanded—only two or three dissolved their connection with the National Order. The organization was kept up, and the seceding delegates called a Convention, to meet at Cincinnati on the 21st November, to see what further should be done.

Had the Order in the North been loyal to Freedom, had it verily believed the Slavery Question the paramount issue, it would have dissolved itself, and its members would have united with the only Party, arrayed distinctly against the Slavery Democracy, on the one issue it audaciously tendered. It was not true to Freedom—it subordinated it to other objects. Its managers generally contemplated a reunion with National Know Nothings, on a "National" basis, as it is affectingly styled. In New York, the Party planted itself openly on the basis of caste, compromise, and "nationality." In Massachusetts, it arrayed itself against the only Party, organized to meet distinctly, both locally and nationally, the Slavery issue. No seceders were needed, and that is what the Know Nothings knew, that the project of forming a Republican Party in New Jersey was postponed, and in New Hampshire, Connecticut, and Rhode Island, the Order resolved to maintain its organization, to insist upon its peculiar Know Nothing Principles, accompanying the resolution, however, with such declarations of Anti-Slavery sentiments as were calculated and designed to preclude anything like a successful attempt at a separate Republican organization. Then followed a strong demonstration on the part of the Know Nothing members of the Legislature of Vermont, a State in which, until then, the Order had not undertaken to assume the lead.

On the 16th of November, they, and others sympathizing with them, met in the State House at Montpelier, and after the passage of the usual Anti-Slavery resolutions, laid down their platform, as follows:

"Resolved, That we are determined to use all honorable efforts to secure such a modification of our naturalization laws, aided by such an elevation of public sentiment, as will preserve the true interests of the nation, and will guarantee the three vital principles of a Republican Government—*Spiritual Freedom*, *Political Freedom*, and *Religious Freedom*—by promoting the great work of *Americanization*.

"Resolved, That we invoke the arm of legislation to arrest that growing evil, the deportation by foreign authorities, of paupers and convicts to our shores, and that the National Constitution requires the chief Executive of our country to be of native birth, we deem it equally important, that other high official functions, and especially our *apostolic* representatives, should also possess no foreign principles to bias their judgment or to influence their official action."

"Resolved, That we are not opposed to the emigration of foreigners to our shore from the Old World, who come imbued with the spirit of the Christian religion, and who seek not to impose upon us the decrees of a foreign ecclesiastical hierarchy, so eminently foreign and hostile to the spirit of our republican institutions, but who are willing to labor with us in extending and perpetuating the blessings of civil and religious liberty, until, from one end of our land to the other, all shall be actuated by the high and holy principles embodied in the Constitution of our land, and in that constitution of political rights, which we deem to be the basis of our national existence."

"Resolved, That we deem the present prohibitory law of this State a part of its sole legislative policy, and that we are opposed to any modification thereof, except such as experience shall demonstrate to be requisite, in order to its greater perfection and efficiency."

"Resolved, That we cordially invite all our fellow-citizens who feel that the above principles are correct and just, and eminently called for by every consideration of justice and patriotism, to meet upon this broad platform, and with us labor to secure their ascendancy in the State of Vermont, and that the Government we may have on the day when our beloved country shall stand forth to the world, a model Republic for freedom, virtue, intelligence, and patriotism."

"Resolved, That the several Editors in this State are respectfully requested to publish the above resolutions."

The *Green Mountain Freeman*, which used to be a Free Soil paper, but now evidently professes Know Nothingism to Republicanism, is delighted. "We publish," it says, "the Anti-Slavery American resolutions of a large and harmonious meeting of the members of the Legislature, to the number of about one hundred, which was held at the State House on one of the last days of the session, that of May for freedom for themselves how much the friends of Freedom may have to hope for or fear from the action of that party in this State."

Next comes the Cincinnati Convention of November 21st, representing the Know Nothings of the North, with the exception of New York, where the Order being already nationalized, no inclined place is required to let it slide easily into the National Order. We need not here repeat the report of its doings, published in the *Era* last week. Lieutenant Governor Farn, elected by the *Republicans* of Ohio, presided, and made a "national" speech. That must be remembered. *Ex-Gov. Farn*, the first *Republican* Governor of Ohio, said nothing for Pennsylvania, made a "national" speech. Let that be remembered. The liberal, Anti-Slavery platform of Mr. Spooner, of the Ohio Know Nothings, was rejected, only eleven names being recorded in its favor out of 104. Let that be remembered. As the Convention had been called by those members of the Philadelphia Convention who would not acquiesce in the repeal of the Missouri Compromise, and as the call had specified opposition to this repeal as one reason for assembling, the delegates could do no less than adopt the following declaration:

"That the repeal of the Missouri Compromise was an infraction of the pledged faith of the nation, and that it should be restored; and if efforts to that end should fail, Congress should refuse to admit into the Union any State tolerating Slavery, which shall be formed out of any portion of the territory from which the institution was excluded by that Compromise."

Well, this is a mere declaration: will they stand by it? They do not say so. They simply recommend to the National Council, to be held at Philadelphia, its adoption, in place of the 12th section. But they do not insist upon it, declare that it is an ultimatum, or intimate that they or their constituents will refuse to act with the National Council, should it decline to follow the recommendation. On the contrary, they evidently proceed on the assumption that the National Council is to be and will be recognized; for they adopted another resolution, recommending that Council "to abolish all, to one degree, and to require the word of honor instead of the obligation now required by the Order." To demonstrate the determination of their constituents in the free States, to maintain their Order, to refrain from the policy of fusion with Republicans, and to hold themselves in a position where they can act for a Know Nothing Presidential nomination, they resolved further—and this was the great work of the Convention—

"That this Convention protest against coalescing with any party which demands the postponement or abandonment of American principles, or the disorganization of the American party."

Mark, this is the position of the men who seceded from the Philadelphia Convention, on account of hostility to the 12th section of the platform! We recollect with what honor they were received at home. Even those who opposed the Order were loud in their praises of the integrity and constancy of these seceding delegates. But how many of them have fulfilled the expectation their conduct then authorized? Henry Wilson can count them on his fingers. The rest have held their Cincinnati Convention, and uphold the "result!"

We have looked over the whole political field, and ascertained the positions and relations of the three Parties. We now appeal to the Anti-Slavery adherents of the Know Nothing Order. Do you expect that the electoral vote of a single slave State will be given to a Presidential candidate, not known to be opposed to the prohibition of Slavery in Federal Territory, to the restoration of the Anti-Slavery clause of the Missouri Compromise, and to all agitation with a view to secure either object? Do you not know that, on this whole question of Slavery, the slaveholding States will be a unit? Do you not believe that the object they unitedly oppose, is of paramount importance? Can it be secured, except by a union of the masses of the free States, acting together for its accomplishment? Do you not know that, thus acting, they could elect a President, openly and honestly committed to the Principle of Policy of Slavery-Prohibition in all Federal Territory?

To effect such a union, is it not plain that there must be one organization, one set of nominations, a common mode of operations?

Say, then, what organization shall this be? Your National Know Nothing organization proposes to save the Union, to maintain all existing arrangements in regard to Slavery, to put down agitation respecting it, and put in the Presidential chair, a man pledged to this policy. Your seceding Know Nothings propose to act with the National Know Nothings, but to recommend to them the adoption of the policy of restoring the Missouri Compromise. Your organization in New York, and to a great extent in Pennsylvania, accepts the Philadelphia Pro-Slavery platform; and in Connecticut, while assuming Anti-Slavery ground, proposes to act with the Nationals. Suppose you could organize a Northern Know Nothing Party on the Anti-Slavery, Native American basis, you could not carry New York and Pennsylvania against the National Know Nothings and Old Line Democracy, too. But you know that you cannot organize an efficient Party on that two-fold basis.

In a few States, you have effected a combination of Anti-Slavery and Native American voters, in one Party; but you know perfectly well that such a combination can never be effected in Ohio, Wisconsin, Illinois, Pennsylvania, New York, and Massachusetts. The real Republicans in those States will suffer defeat a hundred times before they will sacrifice their Principles for a combination embracing a doctrine and policy they believe wrong. No matter, then, how Anti-Slavery you make your Order in some States, you cannot hope to absorb the hundreds of thousands of Anti-Slavery voters who reject your peculiar Know Nothing principles. The only result of your efforts must be, to divide the masses of the free States, and give the victory to the Slave Interest, which, amidst all Party revolutions and combinations, is true forever to itself.

We cannot come over to you, without standing upon your platform, adopting your issues, sustaining your policy, in relation to Know Nothingism, for, in your plan of action, you make that a Question equal in importance to that of Slavery.

How can you ask this at our hands? But

you profess to believe that the Question of Slavery is now, and will be in the coming Presidential election, of greater urgency and importance than any other. You then can give up your organization, and act with us, on this single issue, without any sacrifice of principle. We institute no censorship over private opinion. Hold what views you please, concerning Banks, Tariffs, the Public Lands, Naturalization—only do not make them the basis of Party action—the one Question is, in brief, *Prohibition of Slavery in all Federal Territory*. On this the opponents of Slavery, who can control the electoral college, can be united, and on this alone. Will you then give up all other organizations, unite in the one formed for the settlement of this Question, and thus secure a Republican President, or, by adhering to your Know Nothing Order, divide the opponents of Slavery, and invest the Slave Interest for another four years with all the power and patronage of the Federal Government?

Choose, this day, whom ye will serve.

REPLY TO AN "EXPLANATION."

The *National Era* lays no claim to infallibility, or to exemption from criticism. With its contemporaries it sustains friendly relations, but it does not expect that its views, or the style in which they are promulgated, shall pass unquestioned. It is the right of one journalist to point out what he considers the wrong opinion, to resist what he believes to be the ill-judged policy, of another. Our course is from time to time criticized, sometimes with severity, but we are not at all offended. We are not a sect.

A week or two ago, we commented, with some plainness, upon the constant attempts of the New York *Tribune* to revive at this time the agitation of the Question of Protection, and upon its Pro-Russian policy, desiring to counteract, so far as we could, the influence of what we considered mischievous errors in an influential supporter of the Republican movement. We did full justice to the many excellencies of the paper, questioned neither its ability nor honesty, uttered no word which one gentleman may not speak to another, without violating the rules of good breeding.

It seems, however, that a criticism well meant and courteously uttered, has been badly received. The *Tribune*, in a long editorial, replies to our comments, with ill-nature and arrogance. Our failure to recognize the impersonality of the paper as a shield to the individual editorial contributors, it styles "impertinent." It has "no faith in that wretched tinsel of free trade which the *Era* cries up with such solemn credulity and such pitiable arrogance, and doing the work of Slavery." It is a free trader, "but not of the school of Calhoun, Jeff. Davis, Pierce, and the National *Era*." Our opinion on Protection, it prefers to attribute, not to "moral prejudice," but to "mental weakness, and a blind adherence to early and ignorant prejudices." "Very dishonest or very dull," is the *Era*, in its attempts to define the position of the *Tribune* on the Russian question, but it prefers to consider it "very dull."

This is a fair specimen of the style and temper of the *Tribune's* reply. We do not complain of it. It is so much more civil in its treatment of us than of others who differ from it, that we feel under obligations to it, as for an extraordinary act of courtesy.

It is so much better to be called, *dull*, *mentally weak*, *impertinent*, *pitifully arrogant*, than "a liar and a villain," epithets not unknown in the editorial controversies of the *Tribune* that we really imagine that distinguished impersonality has quite a friendly regard for us.

Still, we always prefer that our friends should be gentlemen. The most cordial relations are never impaired by courtesy. We may like a rude fellow, in spite of his bad breeding—but all the while we cannot but regret that his mother had not taught him to behave himself.

The *Tribune* says we are "impertinent," "pitifully arrogant," &c. Well, it is easy to call names, and just as easy to retort—but Billingsgate would furnish specimens in that line far beyond our genius, if not that of the *Tribune*—so we shall not enter into that contest—the *Tribune* may have the whole field of epithets, without a rival.

As to the immunities claimed by the *Tribune* on account of its *impersonality*, we have a few words to say. Should the editor of the London *Morning Advertiser* have learned that the writer of a certain mischievous article in the London *Times* was Lord John Russell, and should he conclude that such an allusion to this fact might give the public a hint of it, would he help to counteract its influence, the *Tribune* would be very apt to call him a fool if he did not. Suppose, in commenting certain articles on sectionalism in the *Tribune*, anxious to invest them with additional weight in a certain quarter, we should remark that we have reason to believe that they were written by the distinguished author of a standard History of the United States—would this be deemed "impertinent?" We believe that the New York papers, not excepting our standard of good breeding, the *Tribune*, have occasionally, in commenting upon certain articles in the Washington *Union*, for the sake of giving more point to their comments, ascribed authorship to one or another member of the Cabinet. How very "impertinent!"

Now, we tell our contemporaries that its claim to *impersonality*, by its *impersonality*, twenty individuals comprising its corps of editors, from all altitudes, is simply childish; and, as this term is the only personality we have been guilty of, we hope our readers will forgive us. When, in a journal professing to regard the Anti-Slavery movement, represented by the Republican Party, as of paramount importance, we see editorial articles designed to give undue magnitude to other issues, articles which, from certain ear-marks, we know to have been written by one who thinks that the Anti-Slavery movement, from the beginning up to this time, has been a blunder and a failure, we shall state the fact, and the *Tribune* may say just what it pleases.

The *Tribune* attempts to make the *Era* odious to a certain class of its readers, by classing it with "Calhoun, Jeff. Davis, and Franklin Pierce," on the Free Trade Question. Does it not see how easy it is for us to retort, by classing it with the Washington *Union*, "Jeff. Davis," "Franklin Pierce," and "the Slaveholders and Slave-traders," as its caption, on the Russian Question? Such an *captation* appeals to unthinking prejudices, is unworthy any journal that can argue.

The *Tribune* says the Tariff of 1846 was "forced upon the country, for the advantage of the slave-breeding and slave-trading interests; and that the National *Era* lends its 'zealous support' to that great Pro-Slavery measure. That Tariff was passed before the *Era* was commenced, and we have never devoted a single article to its support! "Zealous support," this! We have never, in fact, expressed any opinions about it. We hope the *impersonality* of the *Tribune* will not deem it "impertinent," if we admonish it to be more careful in its statements. But, we never devote responsibility. Now, that there is an occasion, we say frankly, that the Tariff of 1846, in so far as it retards or removes duties imposed by the Tariff of 1842, is an improvement, and the interests of the free States have prospered under it.

How can you ask this at our hands? But

it; but, it is not a Free Trade Tariff, and, in retaining a duty on sugar, so as to make the people pay taxes for the support of a few thousand sugar growers in Louisiana, it deserves public reprobation.

The *Tribune* says that "the Cause of Freedom has never suffered a more injurious blow than from the Tariff of 1846!" Of course, the annexation of Texas, the war against Mexico, the sacrifice of the Wilmot Proviso in 1850, the Fugitive Slave Act, the election of Franklin Pierce, and the repeal of the Missouri Compromise, and all the aggressions of the Slave Power, are no worse than the Tariff of 1846! This needs no answer. Error is never more harmless than when so extravagant as to shock common sense.

We have not time to notice all the strange inconsistencies of the *Tribune*. It holds, as all Protectionists of its school hold, that the Slaveholders want a good market to sell their cotton in, and a cheap market to buy their goods in, and therefore they insist upon Free Trade. Well—that is human nature. But, because, for certain reasons of universal application, we also favor Free Trade, therefore we are an ally of the slave-traders and slave-breeder!" The *Tribune*, on the other hand, denounces this policy—it would seem to be the policy of these respectable classes—it goes therefore for Protection. Mark, the assumption is, that Free Trade plays into the hands of Slaveholders, while Protection is against them. But, what is the argument of this class of political economists at the North? Protect your manufacturers, and you ultimately cheapen the price of the manufactured articles, so that, without a Tariff in the end, the foreign articles could not enter into competition with them. Besides, the increase of manufacturing industry occasions an increased demand for raw materials. Oh—then the upshot of Protection is to cheapen to the planter his machinery and cotton and agricultural implements, in fact all that he needs for housing, working, and clothing his slaves, while it quickens the demand for his cotton, thereby giving new impetus to Slavery and Slavery Extension! Aye, railing at Free Trade because it makes Cotton, King, you would substitute Protection, which will only aggrandize his Kingdom!

As to the Pro-Russian sentiment of the *Tribune*, we must deplore it. It is painful to see a liberal journal denouncing in one column the filibuster usurpation of Walker in Nicaragua, heralding it, says, the absorption of Central America by the United States and Slavery, and advising in another the absorption of unfriendly Turkey by a Slavonian and aggressive Russia. There is no consistency or decency in such a course. It is fit that the Richmond (Va.) *Enquirer* should be an advocate of Russian propaganda, for it says—

"Russia with Slavery has become great, powerful, and contented. Western Europe, without Slavery, has rapidly retrograded, and become poor, seditious, and revolutionary. Taunted as we are with our institutions, we like to appeal to the example of Russian progress and Western European decline. No people in Christendom are so happy and contented as the Russians, except the people of our Southern States."

Nor can we sympathize with the bitterness with which the *Tribune* is accustomed to speak of England. We are the partisans of no foreign Power, but the true policy of this country is to cultivate peace and friendship with the English People. Such inflammatory tirades as the following, from the *Pennsylvania*, are absolutely hateful.

"Above all causes of aversion [to England] aggravated to a feeling of absolute animosity, is the fact of hatred and revenge, that is manifested in the English birth and foster-nursing—Negro Abolitionism."

It is even possible that there was a small catch in the arrangement that the English succeeded in making with the United States, respecting the joint attempt to suppress the slave trade. Perhaps John succeeded in slightly doing JOSEPHUS.

"The time is about to arrive when there may be an end to English interference, generally, and especially to English Abolitionism. As a suitable and altogether proper plan to the present war, England ought to lose India. It is of the deepest interest to the commerce of the United States, that she should quietly disgorge all her Indian conquests. Such a consummation would annihilate Abolitionism. That ebony woman of American politics, whose silly but impudent face blazes not, nor whose vigorous, though split upon, would then disappear forever."

"Indignities have been freely offered to the United States by England, and especially in

THIRTY-FOURTH CONGRESS.

First Session.

Monday, December 5, 1855.

SENATE.

The First Session of the Thirty-fourth Congress commenced this day, conformably to the Constitution of the United States.

The Senate having assembled at 12 o'clock, the oath prescribed by law was administered to the new Senators:

Mr. Crittenden presented the credentials of the Hon. Lyman Trumbull, of Illinois; which were read.

Mr. Cass desired to submit a protest against the election of Mr. Trumbull, from members of the Senate and House of Representatives of Illinois, which he wished laid on the table, and as soon as the Senate was organized he should lay it on the table, and the Committee on the Judiciary or a select committee.

The protest was not read, but is understood to be signed by thirteen Senators and twenty-nine members of the House.

Mr. Trumbull, having taken the oath of office, took his seat.

Mr. Jones, of Iowa, presented the credentials of the Hon. James Harlan, of Iowa; which were read.

Mr. Mason advised to the fact that a protest had been laid on the table last session, from the Senate of Iowa, in relation to the election of Mr. Harlan; but, as he desired that the State should have the benefit of his service, he presumed there would be no objection to his being sworn in, and when the committee were formed, the credentials or protest could be submitted together for decision.

Mr. Mason asked for the reading of the protest, and there were several new Senators, to whom the subject was not familiar.

The protest was read.

Mr. Mason considered it a duty to call for the reading, in order that the subject might be understood. He had formed no definite opinion on the subject, and would therefore make no motion.

Mr. Harlan, having taken the oath prescribed by law, took his seat.

The resolution was agreed to, informing the House that the Senate was organized, and ready to proceed to business; and also fixing the daily hour of meeting at 12 meridian.

And the Senate adjourned.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

At 12 o'clock M. the House was called to order by John W. Taylor, Clerk. The roll was called, when two hundred and twenty-five Representatives and five Delegates answered to their names.

The following are the names of the Representatives who were absent:

Messrs. Gallagher of New Mexico, and Chapman of Nebraska.

For Mr. Speaker—Mr. Jones, of Tennessee. I move that we do not proceed, this day, to the election of a Speaker to preside over this body during the present Congress.

The question being put, the motion was agreed to, and Mr. Jones, of Tennessee, was elected Speaker.

Mr. Jones, of Tennessee, presented the name of William A. Richardson, a Representative from the State of Illinois, as the Democratic candidate for Speaker of this House.

Mr. Whitney, of New York, nominated Humphrey Marshall, of Kentucky.

Mr. Knight, of Pennsylvania, nominated Henry M. Fuller, of Massachusetts.

Mr. Lister, Ohio, nominated Lewis D. Campbell, of Ohio.

Mr. Bishop, of New Jersey, nominated Alexander C. Pennington, of New Jersey.

Mr. Dr. Witt, of Connecticut, nominated Nathaniel P. Banks, of Massachusetts.

The roll was then called, and the tellers reported that the whole number of votes given was 225; necessary to a choice, 113; and that—

Mr. Campbell, of Ohio . . . 53
Mr. Marshall, of Kentucky . . . 30
Mr. Banks, of Massachusetts . . . 21
Mr. Fuller, of Pennsylvania . . . 17
Mr. Pennington, of New Jersey . . . 1
Mr. Harlan, of Ohio . . . 3
Mr. Wheeler, of New York . . . 3
Mr. Thurston, of Rhode Island . . . 3
Mr. Howard, of Michigan . . . 2
Mr. Washburn, of Maine . . . 2
Mr. Mace, of Indiana . . . 1
Mr. Bennett, of New York . . . 1
Mr. Williams, of New York . . . 1
Mr. Rice, of Mississippi . . . 1
Mr. Haven, of New Hampshire . . . 1
Mr. Gallaway, of Ohio . . . 1
Mr. Nichols, of Ohio . . . 1
Mr. Miller, of New York . . . 1
Mr. Sage, of New York . . . 1
Mr. Jones, of Tennessee . . . 1

The following is the vote in detail:

For Mr. Richardson—Messrs. Allen, Allen, Barclay, Barksdale, Bayly, Bell, Boock, Bowie, Boyce, Branch, Brooks, Burnett, Caldwell, Adams, Calkins, Cass, Cobb, Collins, Coker, Cobb of Alabama, Craig, Crawford, Denver, Dowdell, Edmundson, Elliott, English, Evans, Faulkner, Florence, Fuller, of Maine, Gooden, Greenwood, Hall, of Iowa, Lewis of Alabama, Hill, Illinois, Hinkle, Hickman, Houston, Jewett, Jones of Tennessee, Jones of Pennsylvania, Keitt, Kelly, Kidwell, Letcher, Lumpkin, Marshall of Illinois, Maxwell, McMullen, McQueen, Miller of Indiana, Miller, Oliver of Mississippi, Orr, Packard, Paine, Phillips, of Kentucky, Poirer, Smith, Sandage, Savage, Shorter, Smith of Tennessee, Smith of Virginia, Stephens, Stewart, Talbot, Taylor, Vail, Warner, Watkins, Wells, Winslow, and Wright of Tennessee.

For Mr. Campbell—Messrs. Campbell of Kentucky, Castle, Clark of New York, Cox, Cullen, Davis of Maryland, Etheridge, Eustis, Foster, Harris of Maryland, Hoffman, Kennett, Knight, Langley, Lester, Mace, Matteson, McArthur, Miller of New York, Moore, Morgan, Morrill, Murray, Norton, Parker, Pelton, Pennington, Pettit, Sabin, Sapp, Scott, Sherman, Simmons, Stansbury, Waldron, Watson, Wells, Woodruff, and Woodworth.

For Mr. Marshall—Messrs. Campbell of Kentucky, Castle, Clark of New York, Cox, Cullen, Davis of Maryland, Etheridge, Eustis, Foster, Harris of Maryland, Hoffman, Kennett, Knight, Langley, Lester, Mace, Matteson, McArthur, Miller of New York, Moore, Morgan, Morrill, Murray, Norton, Parker, Pelton, Pennington, Pettit, Sabin, Sapp, Scott, Sherman, Simmons, Stansbury, Waldron, Watson, Wells, Woodruff, and Woodworth.

For Mr. Wheeler—Messrs. Banks, Oliver of New York, and Thurston.

For Mr. Thurston—Messrs. Spinner, Wheeler, and Williams.

For Mr. Howard—Messrs. Billingshurst, and Washburn.

For Mr. Washburn—Messrs. Allison and Flagler.

For Mr. Mace—Mr. Campbell of Ohio.

For Mr. Bennett—Mr. Edwards.

For Mr. Williams—Mr. Humphrey Marshall.

For Mr. Lister—Mr. Knox.

For Mr. Gallaway—Mr. Giddings.

For Mr. Nichols—Mr. Grow.

For Mr. Miller—Mr. Pringle.

For Mr. Jones—Mr. Richardson.

Three more ballots were had, with similar results.

No election having yet been made—

Mr. Keitt moved that the House adjourn until to-morrow at 12 o'clock. He, however, withdrew the motion, at the request of

Mr. Jones, of Tennessee, who moved that until otherwise ordered, the daily hour of meeting

of the House be 12 o'clock M.; which motion was carried by the affirmative.

Mr. Keitt then moved the question to adjourn, and it was agreed to—ayes 119, nays not counted.

And at half past two o'clock the House adjourned.

Tuesday, December 4, 1855.

SENATE.

Messrs. Hale, of New Hampshire; Durkee, of Wisconsin; Taylor, of Florida; and Pearce, of Maryland, new members, were sworn in.

The Senate then proceeded to elect a Chaplain, by ballot, with the following result:

Whole number of votes given, 45; necessary to a choice, 23.

Robert C. Dean received 23; W. Hodge, 3; J. G. Butler, 10; Henry Ward Beecher, 2; T. Parker, 1; David (Palm) Brown, 2; H. B. Chapin, 1; Leonidas Rouser, 1; Wm. H. Holcomb, 1; Archbishop Hughes, 1.

The Senate then adjourned.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

The Clerk of the last House (presiding at the Clerk's desk) having read the journal of yesterday's proceedings,

Mr. Jones, of Tennessee, moved that the rules of the House be so amended, that no person be admitted under them within the Chamber, while the House may be in session.

Mr. Morgan objected.

Mr. Jones put the affirmative of the question, and announced the motion carried.

On motion of Mr. Booth, they next proceeded to the fifth ballot for a Speaker, with the following result:

Whole number of votes cast, 220. Necessary to a choice, 111.

Mr. Richardson received 74; L. D. Campbell, 68; Banks, 23; H. M. Fuller, 10; Marshall, 19; Pennington, 8; Wheeler, 1; Walker, 1; Nichols, 1; Howard, 1; Jones, 1; Thurston, 1; Zollicoffer, 1; Mace, 1.

No choice having been effected, they proceeded to a seventh ballot, with the following result:

Whole number of votes cast, 223; necessary to a choice, 112. Mr. Richardson received 75; Campbell, 57; Pennington, 9; Banks, 25; Fuller, 22; Marshall, 18; Walker, 1; Nichols, 1; Lake, 4; Thurston, 2; Zollicoffer, 1; Mace, 1; Carlie, 1; and one or two others received scattering votes.

No choice having been effected, they proceeded to a seventh ballot, with the following result:

Whole number of votes cast, 223; necessary to a choice, 112. Mr. Richardson received 74; Campbell, 54; Pennington, 10; Banks, 25; Fuller, 22; Marshall, 18; Walker, 1; Nichols, 1; Lake, 4; Thurston, 2; Zollicoffer, 1; Mace, 1; Carlie, 1; and one or two others received scattering votes.

No choice having been effected, they proceeded to a seventh ballot, with the following result:

Whole number of votes cast, 223; necessary to a choice, 112. Mr. Richardson received 74; Campbell, 54; Pennington, 10; Banks, 25; Fuller, 22; Marshall, 18; Walker, 1; Nichols, 1; Lake, 4; Thurston, 2; Zollicoffer, 1; Mace, 1; Carlie, 1; and one or two others received scattering votes.

No choice having been effected, they proceeded to a seventh ballot, with the following result:

Whole number of votes cast, 223; necessary to a choice, 112. Mr. Richardson received 74; Campbell, 54; Pennington, 10; Banks, 25; Fuller, 22; Marshall, 18; Walker, 1; Nichols, 1; Lake, 4; Thurston, 2; Zollicoffer, 1; Mace, 1; Carlie, 1; and one or two others received scattering votes.

No choice having been effected, they proceeded to a seventh ballot, with the following result:

Whole number of votes cast, 223; necessary to a choice, 112. Mr. Richardson received 74; Campbell, 54; Pennington, 10; Banks, 25; Fuller, 22; Marshall, 18; Walker, 1; Nichols, 1; Lake, 4; Thurston, 2; Zollicoffer, 1; Mace, 1; Carlie, 1; and one or two others received scattering votes.

No choice having been effected, they proceeded to a seventh ballot, with the following result:

Whole number of votes cast, 223; necessary to a choice, 112. Mr. Richardson received 74; Campbell, 54; Pennington, 10; Banks, 25; Fuller, 22; Marshall, 18; Walker, 1; Nichols, 1; Lake, 4; Thurston, 2; Zollicoffer, 1; Mace, 1; Carlie, 1; and one or two others received scattering votes.

No choice having been effected, they proceeded to a seventh ballot, with the following result:

Whole number of votes cast, 223; necessary to a choice, 112. Mr. Richardson received 74; Campbell, 54; Pennington, 10; Banks, 25; Fuller, 22; Marshall, 18; Walker, 1; Nichols, 1; Lake, 4; Thurston, 2; Zollicoffer, 1; Mace, 1; Carlie, 1; and one or two others received scattering votes.

No choice having been effected, they proceeded to a seventh ballot, with the following result:

Whole number of votes cast, 223; necessary to a choice, 112. Mr. Richardson received 74; Campbell, 54; Pennington, 10; Banks, 25; Fuller, 22; Marshall, 18; Walker, 1; Nichols, 1; Lake, 4; Thurston, 2; Zollicoffer, 1; Mace, 1; Carlie, 1; and one or two others received scattering votes.

No choice having been effected, they proceeded to a seventh ballot, with the following result:

Whole number of votes cast, 223; necessary to a choice, 112. Mr. Richardson received 74; Campbell, 54; Pennington, 10; Banks, 25; Fuller, 22; Marshall, 18; Walker, 1; Nichols, 1; Lake, 4; Thurston, 2; Zollicoffer, 1; Mace, 1; Carlie, 1; and one or two others received scattering votes.

No choice having been effected, they proceeded to a seventh ballot, with the following result:

Whole number of votes cast, 223; necessary to a choice, 112. Mr. Richardson received 74; Campbell, 54; Pennington, 10; Banks, 25; Fuller, 22; Marshall, 18; Walker, 1; Nichols, 1; Lake, 4; Thurston, 2; Zollicoffer, 1; Mace, 1; Carlie, 1; and one or two others received scattering votes.

No choice having been effected, they proceeded to a seventh ballot, with the following result:

Whole number of votes cast, 223; necessary to a choice, 112. Mr. Richardson received 74; Campbell, 54; Pennington, 10; Banks, 25; Fuller, 22; Marshall, 18; Walker, 1; Nichols, 1; Lake, 4; Thurston, 2; Zollicoffer, 1; Mace, 1; Carlie, 1; and one or two others received scattering votes.

No choice having been effected, they proceeded to a seventh ballot, with the following result:

Whole number of votes cast, 223; necessary to a choice, 112. Mr. Richardson received 74; Campbell, 54; Pennington, 10; Banks, 25; Fuller, 22; Marshall, 18; Walker, 1; Nichols, 1; Lake, 4; Thurston, 2; Zollicoffer, 1; Mace, 1; Carlie, 1; and one or two others received scattering votes.

No choice having been effected, they proceeded to a seventh ballot, with the following result:

Whole number of votes cast, 223; necessary to a choice, 112. Mr. Richardson received 74; Campbell, 54; Pennington, 10; Banks, 25; Fuller, 22; Marshall, 18; Walker, 1; Nichols, 1; Lake, 4; Thurston, 2; Zollicoffer, 1; Mace, 1; Carlie, 1; and one or two others received scattering votes.

No choice having been effected, they proceeded to a seventh ballot, with the following result:

Whole number of votes cast, 223; necessary to a choice, 112. Mr. Richardson received 74; Campbell, 54; Pennington, 10; Banks, 25; Fuller, 22; Marshall, 18; Walker, 1; Nichols, 1; Lake, 4; Thurston, 2; Zollicoffer, 1; Mace, 1; Carlie, 1; and one or two others received scattering votes.

No choice having been effected, they proceeded to a seventh ballot, with the following result:

Whole number of votes cast, 223; necessary to a choice, 112. Mr. Richardson received 74; Campbell, 54; Pennington, 10; Banks, 25; Fuller, 22; Marshall, 18; Walker, 1; Nichols, 1; Lake, 4; Thurston, 2; Zollicoffer, 1; Mace, 1; Carlie, 1; and one or two others received scattering votes.

No choice having been effected, they proceeded to a seventh ballot, with the following result:

Whole number of votes cast, 223; necessary to a choice, 112. Mr. Richardson received 74; Campbell, 54; Pennington, 10; Banks, 25; Fuller, 22; Marshall, 18; Walker, 1; Nichols, 1; Lake, 4; Thurston, 2; Zollicoffer, 1; Mace, 1; Carlie, 1; and one or two others received scattering votes.

No choice having been effected, they proceeded to a seventh ballot, with the following result:

Whole number of votes cast, 223; necessary to a choice, 112. Mr. Richardson received 74; Campbell, 54; Pennington, 10; Banks, 25; Fuller, 22; Marshall, 18; Walker, 1; Nichols, 1; Lake, 4; Thurston, 2; Zollicoffer, 1; Mace, 1; Carlie, 1; and one or two others received scattering votes.

No choice having been effected, they proceeded to a seventh ballot, with the following result:

Whole number of votes cast, 223; necessary to a choice, 112. Mr. Richardson received 74; Campbell, 54; Pennington, 10; Banks, 25; Fuller, 22; Marshall, 18; Walker, 1; Nichols, 1; Lake, 4; Thurston, 2; Zollicoffer, 1; Mace, 1; Carlie, 1; and one or two others received scattering votes.

No choice having been effected, they proceeded to a seventh ballot, with the following result:

Whole number of votes cast, 223; necessary to a choice, 112. Mr. Richardson received 74; Campbell, 54; Pennington, 10; Banks, 25; Fuller, 22; Marshall, 18; Walker, 1; Nichols, 1; Lake, 4; Thurston, 2; Zollicoffer, 1; Mace, 1; Carlie, 1; and one or two others received scattering votes.

No choice having been effected, they proceeded to a seventh ballot, with the following result:

Whole number of votes cast, 223; necessary to a choice, 112. Mr. Richardson received 74; Campbell, 54; Pennington, 10; Banks, 25; Fuller, 22; Marshall, 18; Walker, 1; Nichols, 1; Lake, 4; Thurston, 2; Zollicoffer, 1; Mace, 1; Carlie, 1; and one or two others received scattering votes.

No choice having been effected, they proceeded to a seventh ballot, with the following result:

Whole number of votes cast, 223; necessary to a choice, 112. Mr. Richardson received 74; Campbell, 54; Pennington, 10; Banks, 25; Fuller, 22; Marshall, 18; Walker, 1; Nichols, 1; Lake, 4; Thurston, 2; Zollicoffer, 1; Mace, 1; Carlie, 1; and one or two others received scattering votes.

No choice having been effected, they proceeded to a seventh ballot, with the following result:

Whole number of votes cast, 223; necessary to a choice, 112. Mr. Richardson received 74; Campbell, 54; Pennington, 10; Banks, 25; Fuller, 22; Marshall, 18; Walker, 1; Nichols, 1; Lake, 4; Thurston, 2; Zollicoffer, 1; Mace, 1; Carlie, 1; and one or two others received scattering votes.

No choice having been effected, they proceeded to a seventh ballot, with the following result:

Whole number of votes cast, 223; necessary to a choice, 112. Mr. Richardson received 74; Campbell, 54; Pennington, 10; Banks, 25; Fuller, 22; Marshall, 18; Walker, 1; Nichols, 1; Lake, 4; Thurston, 2; Zollicoffer, 1; Mace, 1; Carlie, 1; and one or two others received scattering votes.

No choice having been effected, they proceeded to a seventh ballot, with the following result:

Whole number of votes cast, 223; necessary to a choice, 112. Mr. Richardson received 74; Campbell, 54; Pennington, 10; Banks, 25; Fuller, 22; Marshall, 18; Walker, 1; Nichols, 1; Lake, 4; Thurston, 2; Zollicoffer, 1; Mace, 1; Carlie, 1; and one or two others received scattering votes.

No choice having been effected, they proceeded to a seventh ballot, with the following result:

Whole number of votes cast, 223; necessary to a choice, 112. Mr. Richardson received 74; Campbell, 54; Pennington, 10; Banks, 25; Fuller, 22; Marshall, 18; Walker, 1; Nichols, 1; Lake, 4; Thurston, 2; Zollicoffer, 1; Mace, 1; Carlie, 1; and one or two others received scattering votes.

No choice having been effected, they proceeded to a seventh ballot, with the following result:

Whole number of votes cast, 223; necessary to a choice, 112. Mr. Richardson received 74; Campbell, 54; Pennington, 10; Banks, 25; Fuller, 22; Marshall, 18; Walker, 1; Nichols, 1; Lake, 4; Thurston, 2; Zollicoffer, 1; Mace, 1; Carlie, 1; and one or two others received scattering votes.

No choice having been effected, they proceeded to a seventh ballot, with the following result:

Whole number of votes cast, 223; necessary to a choice, 112. Mr. Richardson received 74; Campbell, 54; Pennington, 10; Banks, 25; Fuller, 22; Marshall, 18; Walker, 1; Nichols, 1; Lake, 4; Thurston, 2; Zollicoffer, 1; Mace, 1; Carlie, 1; and one or two others received scattering votes.

No choice having been effected, they proceeded to a seventh ballot, with the following result:

Whole number of votes cast, 223; necessary to a choice, 112. Mr. Richardson received 74; Campbell, 54; Pennington, 10; Banks, 25; Fuller, 22; Marshall, 18; Walker, 1; Nichols, 1; Lake, 4; Thurston, 2; Zollicoffer, 1; Mace, 1; Carlie, 1; and one or two others received scattering votes.

No choice having been effected, they proceeded to a seventh ballot, with the following result:

Whole number of votes cast, 223; necessary to a choice, 112. Mr. Richardson received 74; Campbell, 54; Pennington, 10; Banks, 25; Fuller, 22; Marshall, 18; Walker, 1; Nichols, 1; Lake, 4; Thurston, 2; Zollicoffer, 1; Mace, 1; Carlie, 1; and one or two others received scattering votes.

No choice having been effected, they proceeded to a seventh ballot, with the following result:

Whole number of votes cast, 223; necessary to a choice, 112. Mr. Richardson received 74; Campbell, 54; Pennington, 10; Banks, 25; Fuller, 22; Marshall, 18; Walker, 1; Nichols, 1; Lake, 4; Thurston, 2; Zollicoffer, 1; Mace, 1; Carlie, 1; and one or two others received scattering votes.

No choice having been effected, they proceeded to a seventh ballot, with the following result:

Whole number of votes cast, 223; necessary to a choice, 112. Mr. Richardson received 74; Campbell, 54; Pennington, 10; Banks, 25; Fuller, 22; Marshall, 18; Walker, 1; Nichols, 1; Lake, 4; Thurston, 2; Zollicoffer, 1; Mace, 1; Carlie, 1; and one or two others received scattering votes.

No choice having been effected, they proceeded to a seventh ballot, with the following result:

Whole number of votes cast, 223; necessary to a choice, 112. Mr. Richardson received 74; Campbell, 54; Pennington, 10; Banks, 25; Fuller, 22; Marshall, 18; Walker, 1; Nichols, 1; Lake, 4; Thurston, 2; Zollicoffer, 1; Mace, 1; Carlie, 1; and one or two others received scattering votes.

No choice having been effected, they proceeded to a seventh ballot, with the following result:

Whole number of votes cast, 223; necessary to a choice, 112. Mr. Richardson received 74; Campbell, 54; Pennington, 10; Banks, 25; Fuller, 22; Marshall, 18; Walker, 1; Nichols, 1; Lake, 4; Thurston, 2; Zollicoffer, 1; Mace, 1; Carlie, 1; and one or two others received scattering votes.

No choice having been effected, they proceeded to a seventh ballot, with the following result:

Whole number of votes cast, 223; necessary to a choice, 112. Mr. Richardson received 74; Campbell, 54; Pennington, 10; Banks, 25; Fuller, 22; Marshall, 18; Walker, 1; Nichols, 1; Lake, 4; Thurston, 2; Zollicoffer, 1; Mace, 1; Carlie, 1; and one or two others received scattering votes.

No choice having been effected, they proceeded to a seventh ballot, with the following result:

Whole number of votes cast, 223; necessary to a choice, 112. Mr. Richardson received 74; Campbell, 54; Pennington, 10; Banks, 25; Fuller, 22; Marshall, 18; Walker, 1; Nichols, 1; Lake, 4; Thurston, 2; Zollicoffer, 1; Mace, 1; Carlie, 1; and one or two others received scattering votes.

No choice having been effected, they proceeded to a seventh ballot, with the following result:

Whole number of votes cast, 223; necessary to a choice, 112. Mr. Richardson received 74; Campbell, 54; Pennington, 10; Banks, 25; Fuller, 22; Marshall, 18; Walker, 1; Nichols, 1; Lake, 4; Thurston, 2; Zollicoffer, 1; Mace, 1; Carlie, 1; and one or two others received scattering votes.

No choice having been effected, they proceeded to a seventh ballot, with the following result:

Whole number of votes cast, 223; necessary to a choice, 112. Mr. Richardson received 74; Campbell, 54; Pennington, 10; Banks, 25; Fuller, 22; Marshall, 18; Walker, 1; Nichols, 1; Lake, 4; Thurston, 2; Zollicoffer, 1; Mace, 1; Carlie, 1; and one or two others received scattering votes.

No choice having been effected, they proceeded to a seventh ballot, with the following result:

Whole number of votes cast, 223; necessary to a choice, 112. Mr. Richardson received 74; Campbell, 54; Pennington, 10; Banks, 25; Fuller, 22; Marshall, 18; Walker, 1; Nichols, 1; Lake, 4; Thurston, 2; Zollicoffer, 1; Mace, 1; Carlie, 1; and one or two others received scattering votes.

No choice having been effected, they proceeded to a seventh ballot, with the following result:

